

### BAKING POWDER

discipline. It has a splendid record. Trains move with the precision of a clock. Not a life of a passenger has been lost since its completion, through any neglect but that of the poor sufferers themselves. Merchants here have told your correspondent that they never did business with a better road, so admirably are their shipments

But, says THE HOUGHTON BILL, the bridge is a part of the continuous line of the Union Pacific Railroad. We claim the contrary. The introduction of this bill in Congress at the present time has caused some comment. As THE TRIBUNE is generous, we beg your indulgence in presenting our views. We say the bridge is a separate and distinct piece of property, and the law and President Lincoln's proclamation

The question to settle is, **WHICH IS THE FACT AND WHICH THE THEORY?** And then we can tell whether or not the bridge is a part of the continuous line. The act of Congress to build the road is entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean," etc., etc. Citing this act, the President says: "I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do, upon the application of the said Company, designate and establish such

first above-named point on the western boundary of the Territory of Iowa, east and opposite to the line of the State of Iowa. The Territory, of Range 13 east of the Sixth Principal Meridian, in the Territory of Nebraska." This was proposed by Mr. Lincoln was noted with interest for the simplicity of his language. The editor about him and the Hon. John D. DeFrance is well known. That gentleman wished the people to understand the meaning of the proposed state papers for another; but Mr. Lincoln decided, saying the people would not understand it so well as the one he used. That was the only one understood by the people. In English language none can doubt. He was elected on a platform declaring that the rights of the States should be held inviolate; and President Lincoln, in his inaugural address, said the United States, implied that Congress had no right to establish an institution of this kind within a State, without the previous consent of the States. He said that Congress had no right to establish the right in the Territories, and also says: "Nothing in this Constitution shall be construed to prejudice the claims of the United States." This was the only one that Lincoln was too much of a statesman not to

Discarding the law and the Constitution, and consulting the standard of the language for the definition of the words "on," "opposite," and "in," we find they have the same meaning Mr. Lincoln wished to convey. This may seem "Pickwickian," but there's reason in it.

The definition of "on" is: "At or near;" "being in contact with the surface or upper part of a thing, and supported by it; placed or lying in contact with the surface."

"Opposite" means: "Standing or situated in front."

The definition of "in" is: "Within."

The people of Iowa claim that "on" means "within"; therefore, the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific is within the state. The venport is on the Mississippi; but no sane man will say it is *within* the river, or supported by the water. At any rate, steamboats do not land at the entrance of the Bartle House. Omaha is on the Missouri; but it will take some time to make our people believe they have to swim to the shore. Chicago is on the lake, not on Michigan; but we never heard of any landing at the entrance of the Grand Pacific. It is the same with the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific. It is "at or near"—not within—the western boundary of Iowa. Therefore, the second definition of the word "on" does not ap-

WHERE IS THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF IOWA ?  
The law of 1845 fixes it in the middle of the main channel of the Missouri River; hence, the terminus is in contact only with the western boundary-line of Iowa. According to the principles of our Constitution in such cases, the boundary is where the authority of the State ends, and where that of the General Government begins. By this it will be seen that President Lincoln had no desire to violate the platform upon which he had been elected, and over-

vide the Constitution, by placing the terminus of the Union Pacific within that State. Now, as the terminus is in contact with the western boundary-line of Iowa, if the Company had gone east of that line, wouldn't it have passed the boundary, and gone within the State of Iowa, which it had no right to do according to the proclamation of the President?

power could be given to dam it up and build a track across it; and that the law of Congress authorized the building of the Road "from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean." He also knew the Missouri was constantly changing its channel. For years it has been working to the eastward, in the vicinity of the designated point; consequently, there must necessarily be a piece of land, made by the action of the river, east of

and opposite Sec. 10, upon which the Company could commence its line, as the building from the middle of the main channel, on the western boundary-line of Iowa, was impracticable, and contrary to the dictates of common sense. Facing Nebraska from the east, the Missouri River, and this piece of ground on its western bank, are opposite Sec. 10, or in front of it, as you please; and the City of Washington, looking

West, is certainly tales of the South of Nebraska. Mr. Lincoln doubtless considered this when he issued his proclamation, and used the words "on" and "opposite" to express himself clearly, as his message to Congress in the following December demonstrates. In that message he says, in speaking of the Union Pacific: "The route of the main line of the road has been definitely located for 100 miles westward from the INITIAL POINT AT OMAHA CITY, NEB."

To sum up, and give, as we think, the true meaning of the language of the proclamation, it would appear to read thus:

"I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do, upon the application of the said Company, designate and establish such first-named point at or near the western boundary of the State of Iowa, east of and standing or situated in front of the east line of Sec. 10, within Town

ship 15 north, of range 13 east of the Sixth Principal Meridian, within the Territory of Nebraska."

Now, as the then Territory has since become the State of Nebraska, and as the terminus has been located at Omaha beyond the shadow of a doubt, Congress cannot constitutionally pass a law in retrospect, to take away our rights or claims, and give them to the State of Iowa.

The Constitution expressly forbids such legislation, and also says: "Nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice the claims of any particular State." We claim that, as this right was given to us when a Territory, it was not impaired, but strengthened, by our admission into the Union as a State; and that any further action by the General Government is illegal and unconstitutional, because, by such action, our claims to this territory as a State

will be prejudiced. If Congress is dissatisfied, it should not have conferred this right upon us in the first place. As it is, it should let the subject drop.

As the terminus was fixed at Omaha by the "good President," there was

A GAP

to fill at the Missouri River. Congress—having no constitutional right, according to the opinions

of the Hon. Thaddeus Stevens, the Hon. James F. Wilson, of Iowa, and other able debaters upon constitutional law, and as we believe we have already shown, to grant a charter to construct a railroad within, through, or into a sovereign State, without previous consent, but having the necessary authority to provide for bridging the navigable streams—authorized the Union Pacific, in 1864, to maintain a ferry upon, or to construct

bridge across the Missouri. As the law was optional, the Company refused to construct the bridge, as a large portion of their road had been completed and accepted by the Government, from their terminus at Sec. 10, in Nebraska, because to have done so would have been a gratuitous act on their part, as there was no additional subsidy allowed for doing the work.

charter to bridge the Missouri to a number of the citizens of Council Bluffs; but it fell through on account of the opposition of other citizens of that point, who sent a committee to Washington to defeat it. Convinced that it would be to the benefit of commerce and travel, the Union Pacific Railroad Company finally requested and obtained a special charter from Congress to build a bridge at a point 2 miles below the terminus, for

the speedy transportation of freight and passengers across the Missouri River. The charter was granted in 1871, two years after the completion of the road from Omaha, and its acceptance by the Government. The act authorized the Company to issue bonds, and secure the



























committee in another Iowa town ca

Love of life is the strongest passion in man. The punishment which takes away life must, then, be the strongest deterrent to crime. Imprisonment for a long term, the skillful use of quibbles, technicalities, the occasional corruption of juries, and the abuses of pardoning power, have shortened the term of the man who is sentenced to life imprisonment less than ten years! It

too, that any such sentence is passed upon the man who hangs does not harm man life cheap. It puts a value upon it, and inflicts the penalty upon the man who robs and kills. It is a milk-and-water sentimentalism over the fate of a brute whose hands are reeking with innocent blood, and cries to the poor, deluded man have time to repent. Justice looks at the bleeding body of the man, and replies: "What turn a will to loose on society? Deliberate murder deserves most reward in death."

**LICENSE OR NO LICENSE.**

The Rev. J. W. HANSON, who a few days ago made his appearance a couple of columns in the columns of THE TRIBUNE in connection with the controversy, is not satisfied with the result of the controversy, but inflicts two more columns more of it on the *New Covenant* column and a half of it is devoted to the wrongfulness, sinfulness, and criminality of "licensing" the sale of stimulants. THE TRIBUNE, he says, proposes to "license

**sale of liquor:**  
THE TRIBUNE complains of taxes, and won't be lenient that quadruples them. The Tribune says that the price of port and sherry is \$1.00 per gallon, because the men who caused the war. THE TRIBUNE scourges criminals, but would have them make men such.

And so on through a column of that sort of statement. Now, the fact is, THE TRIBUNE has not said a word for or against the sale of liquors, or "licensing" the sale of liquors, or drinking goes on all the same whether the liquors are licensed or unlicensed. The Cons. of Ohio has prohibited the licensing sale of liquor in that State since 1851.

drinking goes on all the same whether  
are licensed or unlicensed. The Cons

of Ohio has prohibited the licensing sale of liquor in that State since 1851. The Constitution of Illinois does not fit. No saloon is licensed in Ohio; all are licensed in Illinois. What is the reason? There is just as much liquor consumed in Ohio *per capita* as in Illinois and perhaps more. There is no less poverty there than here, but perhaps as much poverty, suffering, and crime from intemperance, and perhaps more. A non-licensing system in Ohio has resulted in less crime than a licensing system. No drunkard, prevented no one from

It is  
There is just as much liquor

sumed in Ohio *per capita* as in  
and perhaps more. There is no less  
entirely there than here, but perhaps  
fully as much poverty, suffering, and  
from inebriation, and perhaps more  
non-licensing system in Ohio has re-  
no drunkard, prevented no one from  
ing, and nobody from selling. There  
more liquor-shops in Ohio than in  
because they have no tax to pay. It is  
trade" in whiskey in Ohio, whereas the  
tariff on the sale in Illinois. From  
license-tax the cities, towns, and coun-  
tyness derive about half a million  
Illinois receive. In Ohio no money

It is a gross error of Mr. HANSON to suppose that the short-sighted class to whom the sale of liquors depends upon the withholding of licenses to vend, will not, in point of fact, make the slightest difference whether the saloons are licensed or unlicensed. The sale of liquor depends upon the demand for it. It is the appetite and not the license which creates a million of people in Ohio for liquor of every kind which cause 30,000 unlicensed saloons to be kept open right and day to

them. If these people should take to quit drinking liquor, all the saloons in Ohio would instantly be closed, and the owners would have to turn their attention to other business. If half the drinkers of Ohio abandoned all stimulants, half the saloons would close, and so in any other proportion the results would follow. It is a notion that liquor is sold in Chicago only by permission of the Illinois only by permission of the state in the shape of a license, and that if such license were withdrawn

would be sold by the saloons or dram-  
people. Nothing could be more absurd  
such an idea. Abolish all liquor li-  
censes to-morrow, and the purchase and  
consumption of liquors will proceed  
cessation or diminution precisely  
case in Ohio. So long as a million  
in Illinois want alcoholic beverages  
to pay for them, it does not matter  
whether the vendors are "licensed"  
ply them or not. It is strange that  
one claiming to be intelligent can  
the contrary in the face of the facts

The present indications are that the Congressional Conference Committee on Finance will recommend an increase of eight foreign wines. There is some difference between the House and Senate exact amount, but both agree on a final increase. The present system for the duties on wines is very complex and there ought to be a change; change.

...should not increase all in duty, but rather a decrease, if the be different. At present, the duty wine is 25 cents a gallon on wine not more than 40 cents at the place port; 60 cents on wines costing more than \$1; \$1, and 25 per cent *ad valorem* on costly wines. Under this tariff provisions for 1878 were as follows:

Wines paying duties of 25 cents a gallon...  
Wines paying 41 and 58 per centum *ad valorem*...  
This shows that the light wines and brandy were imported in large quantities.

amount of those of higher price was comparatively small. Now the Committee desire to raise the duty at present paying a duty of 25 cents per gallon, while the Senate Committee are satisfied with 40 cents. The report will probably fix the duty somewhere between 40 and 50 cents. Such a duty would have three direct results:

1. Drunkenness will increase.
2. A practical temperance agent in the light wine of France and Italy every man may drink them with

They are less injurious to the health than tea, or to the stomach than cider. It is apt to be drank to excess. There is such temptation to their immoderate use, there is with distilled drinks. The tariff upon them is to diminish consumption. To the extent which they go into distilleries, whisky, rum, and brandy are substituted. In this way Congress has, one blow, do more to encourage drinking than the temperance reformers can encourage it. They will literally for the sake of the revenue, encourage the use of whisky by a tariff.

light wines too costly for their consumption.  
If the duty is doubled, the result  
change will diminish the consumption  
wines one-half. The increase of



[illegible]







\_\_\_\_\_



